

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this action. No claims have been amended or canceled. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserve the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicants reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over O’Flaherty et al. (US 6,275,824), hereinafter “O’Flaherty”, in view of Wong et al. (US 6,578,037), hereinafter “Wong”.

The Office acknowledges that O’Flaherty fails to teach wherein each system consists of an administrator configuration. The Office cites Wong as disclosing explicit, implicit and field of clearance systems consisting of an administrator configuration. The Office specifically cites FIG. 1 at col. 4, lines 25-47 for support of this assertion. The Office then concludes it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify O’Flaherty by incorporating Wong to yield Applicants’ invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is noted in that the purpose of Wong (col. 5, lines 34-38) is to enable users to independently implement their own policy functions in a manner that reduces or eliminates the need to cooperate with other users. The purpose of O’Flaherty is to allow a consumer to specify when and under which circumstances personal information may be retained or shared with or sold to others (col. 5, lines 20-22). Thus, combining Wong with O’Flaherty, as the Office has

done, would render O’Flaherty unworkable. As stated in the MPEP, where a “proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.” (MPEP § 2143.01 § V (citing *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984))). Applicant respectfully submits that the modification of O’Flaherty according to the teachings of Wong would render the O’Flaherty invention unsatisfactory for its intended purposes, to wit, to allow a consumer to specify when and under which circumstances personal information may be retained or shared with or sold to others (col. 5, lines 20-22). In order for the consumer to specify when information is shared, the consumer must configure the system. This is outside the scope of Applicants’ claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-21.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants’ undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Carl F. Ruoff/

Carl F. Ruoff
Reg. No.: 34,241

Date: November 19, 2008

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
Telephone (518) 449-0044
Facsimile (518) 449-0047